

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,131	09/22/2003		Thomas L. Naglich	SET157	8410
7590 12/08/2004			EXAM	INER	
Sean A. Kauf	hold		PRICE, RICHARD THOMAS JR		
P.O. Box 131447 Carlsbad, CA 92013				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Carisbau, CA	Carisbau, CA 92013			3643	
				DATE MAILED: 12/08/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	•
		10/666,131	NAGLICH ET AL.	9
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	<i>_</i>
		Thomas Price	3643	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication r Reply	n appears on the cover shee	with the correspondence address	ss
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatic period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by eply received by the Office later than three months after the red patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, maron. a reply within the statutory minimum of period will apply and will expire SIX (6) No statute, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this commune ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
Status				
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	22 September 2003.		
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.		
	Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice un			erits is
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	hdrawn from consideration.	·	
Applicati	on Papers			
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.		
10) 🗌	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[_	accepted or b) objected	to by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	o the drawing(s) be held in abe	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the confidence of the confi			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) <u></u> a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But ee the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in priority documents have be ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National Sta	ge
Attachment	• •	_		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94)	4) Intervie	w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date	
3) 🛛 Infom	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S · No(s)/Mail Date <u>9-22-0</u> 3		of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 5, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 5, line 5, the phrase "an upwardly through and an upper side" is unclear as to its meaning.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chrietzberg et al U.S. Patent 3,525,493.

The intended use of the claimed tool, "for cracking crabs" is a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention that must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). The apparatus of Chrietzberg et al includes a base 20 having a top surface, a bottom surface, a pair of end edges and a pair of side edges as shown in Figures 1-3.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,131

Art Unit: 3643

The cracking member 40 is provided. A coupler 10 is attached to said top surface for selectively attaching said cracking member to said base such that the cracking member extends upwardly from said base. Regarding claim 4, the cracking member 40 includes a plate having an upper edge and a lower edge, a flange 44 is attached to and extends along a length of said lower edge and is oriented generally perpendicular to a plane of said plate. The flange exends in opposite direction with respect to said plane of said plate. As for claim 5, the coupler 10 includes a raised section that extends generally between said end edges of said top surface and includes a slot 18 extending through a length thereof. The slot 18, as seen in Figures 2 and 3, include a horizontal portion and a vertical portion extending away from the horizontal portion and upwardly through an upper side of the raised surface. As seen in Figure 2, the flange 44 is removably extended into said horizontal portion such that said plate extends upwardly through said vertical portion. In regard to claim 6, the apparatus includes a plurality of feet 24 attached to said bottom surface. As for claim 7, as seen in the drawings, the feet 24 are elongated and each generally extends between said end edges of said base 20. In regards to claims 8 and 9, the space (unnumbered) between the feet and below the base is considered to be a cracking member storage well that extends into one of said end edges.

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chrietzberg et al U.S. Patent 3,525,493. Regarding claims 2 and 11, the claimed dimensions for the end edges and side edges have not been discussed in the specification as being critical. The Examiner considers claimed dimensions to be more directed to aesthetics than a patentably distinct feature, and as such, will not be given patentable weight. In regards to claims 3 and 10, Chrietzberg et al discuss the base material being made of plastic. There are some plastic type materials which float and some which do not float. As a result, it would have been an obvious matter of choice in mechanical design to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a variety of plastic materials to form the sign base of Chrietzberg et al depending on the site conditions, and/or material performance needed.

Prior Art of Record

The prior art of record lists a series of patents similar in structure to the Applicant's claimed tool. These patents teach various display devices having base member, and a display member removably positioned in the base.

Conclusion

Summary: Claims 1-11 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Price whose telephone number is 703-308-

Application/Control Number: 10/666,131 Page 5

Art Unit: 3643

2694. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30a.m. to 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 703-308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner GAU: 3643

rtp